REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed on July 31, 2007, the Examiner noted that claims 3-5, 9-11, 16, 17, 20, 21, and 25 were pending and rejected claims 3-5, 9-11, 16, 17, 20, 21, and 25. Claims 3, 9, 16, 20 and 25 have been amended, new claim 26 has been added; and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 3-5, 9-11, 16, 17, 20, 21, 25 and 26 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter is believed to have been added. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed below.

REJECTION under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 3-5, 9-11, 16-17 and 20-21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,795,711 (Sivula) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,829,474 (Adachi). These rejects are respectfully traversed.

Claim 3 has been amended to recite:

> a processor receiving a content transmission request ...for broadband transfer...from a separate device which is different from said receiving device and receives and views a content for narrowband transfer, over said mobile communication network not via said receiving device...wherein the content data is provided automatically by said content data providing information processing apparatus, in response to the receipt, from said processor...to said receiving device over said broadband network

(claim 3, lines 14-18 and 25-28). Claims 9, 16 and 20 have been amended to recite similar features. However, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Sivula nor Adachi teach or suggest at least the aforementioned features of these independent claims.

By at least the aforementioned features, once a processor receives a request, over a mobile communication network, for a broadband transfer from another device, the processor transmits content identification and the address of the receiving device to the content data providing information processing apparatus. Upon receipt, content data is provided automatically by the content data providing information processing apparatus to the receiving device. As a result, the receiving device is able to view the contents.

Sivula is directed to a multimedia message content adaptation. Specifically, special content messages between mobile devices are carried out by a special application service center that receives a content message from an originating mobile device and in response sends the message to the other mobile device notifying the user. In response, the user must open the message and select the URL that was included in the message. In addition, the user enters an USERID and PASSWORD that was provided in the message, thereby, enabling the

user to view the contents. (See Sivula, Abstract; Col. 7, Lines 20-29). Therefore, based upon the users' response, the user will be able to view the content of the Web site.

Thus, Sivula does not teach or suggest "a processor receiving a content transmission request...for broadband transfer...from a separate device...and [processor] receives and views a content for narrowband transfer, over said mobile communication network...wherein the content data is provided automatically by said content data providing information processing apparatus, in response to the receipt, from said processor...to said receiving device over said broadband network" as recited in claim 3, for example.

Further, the Office Action has acknowledged that Sivula does not specifically disclose a connection between the processor and the content data providing information processing apparatus which is different from the first apparatus and using a broadband connection through a gateway. (See Office Action, Page 4). The Office Action alleges that Adachi discloses a content data providing information processing apparatus. However, it is respectfully submitted that Adachi does not disclose a content data providing information processing apparatus.

Adachi is directed to a multimedia value added service providing system in a telecommunications network. Specifically, Adachi merely discloses a system with two main servers: a control server and a gateway server, allowing a value-added service server to provide any combination of services to a terminal, as shown in Fig. 1. Moreover, the value-added service server is an aggregate of servers which provide a corresponding value-added service to individual users. (See Adachi Col. 4, Lines 38-39). For example, the value-added service server includes an image server, a location server, a voicemail server, etc. (See Adachi Col. 4, Lines 38-51). Moreover, these servers are connected to the control server through respective interfaces. The control server provides integrated services to individual users so each user can use services. (See Adachi Col. 4, Lines 52-59). Therefore, based upon the users' response the server will respond providing a particular service.

Thus, Adachi does not teach or suggest "the content data is provided automatically by said content data providing information processing apparatus, in response to the receipt, from said processor...to said receiving device over said broadband network" as recited in claim 3, for example.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that neither Sivula nor Adachi or any combination thereof teaches or suggests the aforementioned features of claim 3. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 3 patentably distinguishes over the combination of references. Further, it is respectfully submitted that amended claims 9, 16, and 20 patentably distinguish over the

combination of references for reasons similar to those discussed above. The dependent claims should also be allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests for reconsideration and withdrawal of rejected claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

REJECTION under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by US 20020155848 (Suryanarayana). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 25 has been amended to recite:

> receiving on a information server via mobile communications network a request from a mobile device which receives and views a content for narrowband transfer comprising a uniform resource locator of the content for broadband transfer and an address of a receiving device...and
>
> transmitting from the information server via a gateway to a content server on a broadband network not via said receiving device...the content server transmitting automatically to the receiving device separate from the mobile device the contents addressed by the uniform resource locator

(claim 25, lines 2-10). Applicants respectfully submit that Suryanarayana does not teach or suggest at least the aforementioned features of amended claim 25.

By at least the aforementioned features, after receiving the request from a mobile communications network, the information server receives and views content for narrowband transfer. Then a transmission is sent from the information server via a gateway to a content server, including a uniform resource locator of the content and address of the receiving device. Upon receipt, the content server transmits automatically to the receiving device the contents addressed by the uniform resource locator. Thus, the receiving device is able to view the contents.

Suryanarayana is directed to a World Wide Web content synchronization between wireless devices. Specifically, the Web content synchronization system and process enables two or more device users to view the Web contents simultaneously. A User1 sends a "uni-sync" signal destined for user2 to a Wireless Access Protocol (WAP) Proxy 1. Wherein the WAP Proxy 1 acts as a push initiator and a sync proxy and transmits a "Push Sync" signal to the WAP Push Proxy Gateway, which transmits a "Push Service Indication" signal to User2. Once User2 has accepted the synchronization session, a one-way synchronized session is enabled. (See Suryanarayana, Paragraph 0045-0049). Stated another way, once the user has accepted the synchronization session, either of the mobile device users may request content from the Web Site.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Suryanarayana does not teach or suggest the aforementioned features of amended claim 25. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 25 patentably defines over Suryanarayana.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of rejection of independent claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

NEW CLAIM

New claim 26, which has been added, recites:

> A method, comprising:
> receiving content data at a network server via a mobile communications network from a device which receives and views a content for narrowband transfer, the content data including content identification of a content for broadband transfer, determined by a user, and an address of a receiving device, determined by said user;
> transmitting said content data including the content identification and the address of the receiving device to a content server not via said receiving device; and
> transmitting the content to the receiving device automatically by the content server.

It is respectfully submitted that the prior arts fail to teach or suggest the aforementioned features of new claim 26. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 26 patentably distinguishes over the combination of references.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. Further, all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: October 31, 2007

By: Patel

Sheetal S. Patel
Registration No. 59,326

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501